



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/459,493	12/13/1999	MOSHE RUBIN	6866-101C2	1209

7590 09/30/2003

Marc Sockol
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P24

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/459,493

Applicant(s)

RUBIN ET AL.

Examiner

Carl Colin

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/13/1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,7,9-11. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Pursuant to USC 131, claims 1-80 are presenting for examination.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable codes (see p.1, line31; p.2, lines 3 and 31; and p.3, lines 6 and 24).

Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable codes. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims **5, 18, 31, 40, 57, and 70** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- 2.1 Regarding **claims 5, 18, 31, 40, 57, and 70**, the phrase "substantially similar" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "substantially similar"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.1 **Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10-14, 17, 19-21, 23-27, 30, 32, 34-36, 39, 41, 43-53, 56, 58-60, 62-66, 69, 71-75, 77-80** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,881,287 to **Mast**.

3.2 **As per claim 1, Mast** substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images copied from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). **Mast** discloses the step of transmitting stored pixel data from a computer memory to a video RAM (column 3, lines 25-57). As defined in the dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the

Art Unit: 2133

image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying protected image within the image in memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected pixel data within the stored pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61). **Mast** further discloses the steps of modifying the stored pixel data, thereby generating modified pixel data within which individual pixel datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected (column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1); and in response to pixel data being copied from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum copied from the video RAM, that is protected, with substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

As per claims 4, 30, and 56, Mast discloses the limitation of further comprising the step of displaying the pixel data in the video RAM (column 9, lines 22-30).

As per claim 6, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by a screen capture command (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 7, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by command to copy screen data to a clipboard (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claims 8, 32, and 60, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the protected pixel data is pixel data for at least one protected digital image (see fig. 8 and column 10, line 52 through column 12).

3.3 **As per claims 12 and 34, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

3.4 **As per claims 13 and 35, Mast** discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted stored pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

3.5 **As per claim 10, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47). **Mast** further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

3.6 **As per claim 11, Mast** discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

3.7 **As per claim 14, Mast** substantially teaches the limitations of claim 14 using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 14** recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 1 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage, a digital filter to identify and modify

Art Unit: 2133

pixel data, and processors to replace or copy information to memory. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

3.8 **As per claim 17, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claim 17** is similar to the rejected **claim 4**. Therefore, **claim 17** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 4**.

3.9 **As per claim 19, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claim 19** recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are distinct data busses. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system has distinct data buses to transfer data for storage (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.10 **As per claim 20, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claim 20** recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are the same data bus. The fact of using the same data bus instead of two distinct data buses may reduce cost. However, having one bus may slow down the process of transmitting data, and furthermore, it does not provide any backup if the bus fails. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of using either the same bus or distinct data buses (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.11 **Claims 21, 41, and 75** are similar to the rejected **claim 8** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 21, 41, and 75** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 8**.

3.12 As per **claims 23-26**, **Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claims 23-26** are similar to the rejected **claims 10-13** respectively. Therefore, **claims 23-26** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 10-13**.

As per **claim 27**, **Mast** substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images copied from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). **Mast** discloses the step of transmitting stored pixel data from a computer memory to a video RAM (column 3, lines 25-57). As defined in the dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying protected image within the image in memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected pixel data within the stored pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61). **Mast** further discloses the steps of modifying the stored pixel data, thereby generating modified pixel data within which individual pixel datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected (column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

3.13 As per **claim 36**, **Mast** substantially teaches the limitations of claim 36 using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 36** recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 1 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage and a digital filter to identify and modify pixel data. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

Claims 39 and 69 are similar to the rejected **claim 4** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 39 and 69** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 4**.

3.14 **Claims 43 and 79** are similar to the rejected **claim 12** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 43 and 79** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 12**.

3.15 **Claims 44 and 80** are similar to the rejected **claim 13** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 44 and 80** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 13**.

3.16 **As per claim 45, Mast** substantially teaches a method for protecting pixel data captured from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). As defined in the dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying protected pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61). **Mast** further discloses the pixel data being such that individual pixel datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected (column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1); and in response to pixel data being copied from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum copied from the video RAM, that is protected, with

Art Unit: 2133

substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

As per claim 46, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by a screen capture command (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 47, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by command to copy screen data to a clipboard (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 48, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47). **Mast** further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

As per claim 49, Mast discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

3.17 **As per claim 50, Mast** substantially teaches the limitations of **claim 50** using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 50** recites the same

Art Unit: 2133

limitation as the rejected claim 45 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system comprising a data bus and a pixel processor. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage, and processors to replace individual pixel datum. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

Claim 51 is similar to the rejected **claim 10** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claim 51** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 10**.

Claim 52 is similar to the rejected **claim 11** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claim 51** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 11**.

3.18 As per **claim 53**, **Mast** substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images copied from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-62). **Mast** discloses the steps of modifying the stored pixel data so as to mark it as being protected (column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1). As defined in the dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** further discloses the step of transmitting stored pixel data including the modified protecting pixel data from a computer memory to a video RAM (column 3, lines 25-57 and column 9, line 48 through column 10). **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying protected image within the image in memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected pixel data within the stored pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61); and in response to pixel data being copied from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum copied from the video RAM, that

Art Unit: 2133

is protected, with substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1).

3.19 **Claims 58-59** are similar to the rejected **claims 6-7** respectively. Therefore, **claims 58-59** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 6-7**.

3.20 **Claims 62-63** are similar to the rejected **claims 10-11** respectively. Therefore, **claims 62-63** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 10-11**.

3.21 **As per claim 64, Mast** discloses the limitation of wherein the protected pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

3.22 **As per claim 65, Mast** discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted stored pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

3.23 **As per claim 66, Mast** substantially teaches the limitations of **claim 66** using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 66** recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 53 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system comprising a data bus and a pixel processor. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage, and processors to modify and replace pixel data. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

Art Unit: 2133

3.24 As per claim 71, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. Claim 71 recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are distinct data busses. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system has distinct data buses to transfer data for storage (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.25 As per claim 72, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. Claim 72 recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are the same data bus. The fact of using the same data bus instead of two distinct data buses may reduce cost. However, having one bus may slow down the process of transmitting data and furthermore it does not provide any backup if the bus fails. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of using either the same bus or distinct data buses (see column 4, lines 19-28).

3.26 As per claim 73, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. Claim 73 recites the limitation of wherein said first pixel processor and said second pixel processor are distinct processors. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system may have distinct processors for different tasks (see also column 4, lines 19-28).

3.27 As per claim 74, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. Claim 74 recites the limitation of wherein said first pixel processor and said second pixel processor are the same processors. The fact of using the same processor instead of two distinct processors may reduce cost. It is apparent to one skilled in the art to have a system using a CPU as a processor to

Art Unit: 2133

perform all the tasks. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of using either the same processor or distinct processors (see also column 4, lines 19-28).

3.5 **As per claim 77, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66 and further discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

Mast further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

3.6 **As per claim 78, Mast** discloses the claimed system of claim 66 and further discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2133

Claims 2-3, 5, 15-16, 18, 28-29, 31, 37-38, 40, 54-55, 57, 67-68, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,881,287 to **Mast** in view of US Patent 6,088,355 to **Mills et al.**

4.1 As per **claims 2 and 28**, **Mast** discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9, lines 59-67). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant bits of pixel data. To a person having ordinary skill in copyright protection of digital data, modifying means changing any of the bits therein, as to the least significant or the most significant pixel data as well as any of the color components. **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13, line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the stored pixel of **Mast** to set the least significant bits of pixel data as **Mills et al.** teaches. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.2 As per **claims 3 and 29**, **Mast** discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9, lines 59-67). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant bits of the blue color components. **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13,

Art Unit: 2133

line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Mast** to set the least significant bits of the blue color components. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.3 As per claim 5, **Mast** substantially teaches the claimed method of claim 4. **Mast** discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9, lines 59-67). **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13, line 59 through column 14, line 9). As per the limitation of **claim 5**, since the term “substantially similar” is indefinite, examiner interprets that the modified pixel data when modifying the least significant bit as disclosed by **Mills et al.** will appear substantially similar to the stored pixel data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Mast** to set the least significant bits of the blue color components. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.4 **Claims 15, 37, and 67** are similar to the rejected **claim 2** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 15, 37, and 67** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 2**.

Art Unit: 2133

4.5 **Claims 16, 38, and 68** are similar to the rejected **claim 3** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 16, 38, and 68** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 3**.

4.6 **Claims 18, 40, and 70** are similar to the rejected **claim 5** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 18, 40, and 70** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 5**.

4.7 **Claims 31 and 57** are similar to the rejected **claim 5**. Therefore, **claims 31 and 57** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 5**.

4.8 **As per claim 54, Mast** discloses a method of marking by modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9, lines 59-67). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant bits of pixel data. **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13, line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of marking of **Mast** based on values of the least significant bits of pixel data. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

4.9 As per claim 55, **Mast** discloses modifying the stored pixels with any pattern or distorted in some way to indicate that those regions correspond to protected images (column 9, lines 59-67). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying the least significant bits of the blue color components. **Mills et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying the least significant bit of each of the R, G, and B color values to provide a 4-bit transparency weight for each pixel (column 13, line 59 through column 14, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of marking protected pixels of **Mast** to set the least significant bits of the blue color components as suggested by **Mills et al.** This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mills et al.** so as to indicate that the pixel data are protected.

5. Claims 9, 22, 33, 42, 61, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,881,287 to **Mast** in view of US Patent 6,463,467 to **Mages et al.**

5.1 As per claim 9, **Mast** substantially teaches the claimed method of claim 8. **Mast** does not explicitly disclose downloading the at least one protected image over the Internet. **Mages et al.** in an analogous art teaches downloading the protected images over the Internet (see columns 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Mast** to include the step of downloading the protected images over the Internet. This modification would have been obvious because one

Art Unit: 2133

skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Mages et al.** for easy access and to choose from a variety of protected images.

5.2 **Claims 22, 42, and 76** are similar to the rejected **claim 9** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 22, 42, and 76** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 9**.

5.3 **Claims 33 and 61** are similar to the rejected **claim 9**. Therefore, **claims 33 and 61** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 9**.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. US Patent 5,745,254 Satou

This patent pertains to an image reading device for obtaining good images at constant speed.

b. US Patent 5,012,232 Fadern

This patent pertains to a video display controller for controlling the display of characters stored in a bit plane memory.

c. US Patent 5,642,207 Smitt

This patent pertains to an optical scanner with variable line resolution to collect information from an original along lines with a predetermined mutual spacing.

Art Unit: 2133

6.1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 703-305-0355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and every other Friday, 8:30-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 703-305-9595. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

cc

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

September 17, 2003

Guy J. Lamane
for

Albert DeCady
Primary Examiner